UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/600,201	06/20/2003	Vladimir I. Slepnev	046264-065331	5135	
72779 Mark J. FitzGer	7590 02/14/200 ald	EXAMINER			
Nixon Peabody		BERTAGNA, ANGELA MARIE			
100 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110-2131			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1637		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/14/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/600,201	SLEPNEV, VLADIM	IR I.
Examiner	Art Unit	
ANGELA BERTAGNA	1637	

		ANGELA BERTAGNA		1637	
The MAILING DATE of this co	mmunication appe	ears on the cover sheet wi	ith the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2008</u> FAILS	TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	ON FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection application, applicant must timely file of application in condition for allowance; for Continued Examination (RCE) in conjection periods: 	one of the following (2) a Notice of App	replies: (1) an amendment, eal (with appeal fee) in comp	affidavit pliance v	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months	from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the no event, however, will the statutory present Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, checked	eriod for reply expire I neck either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from th (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WH	ne mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFI have been filed is the date for purposes of determ under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the esset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received the control of the control	nining the period of exexpiration date of the seven by the Office later	tension and the corresponding a shortened statutory period for re than three months after the ma	amount o eply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 09 the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has lappeal MENDMENTS	(37 CFR 41.37(a)),	or any extension thereof (37	7 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed aft	er a final rejection.	but prior to the date of filing	a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that woul (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new mat (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims would be appeared. (See 37 CFR 1)	d require further co ter (see NOTE belo ne application in belo vithout canceling a	nsideration and/or search (s w); ter form for appeal by mater	see NOT rially red	E below); ucing or simplifying tl	
4. The amendments are not in compliance. Applicant's reply has overcome the fo	ce with 37 CFR 1.1		Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) non-allowable claim(s). 			parate, ti	mely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed how the new or amended claims would The status of the claim(s) is (or will be Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-73</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration	d be rejected is pro) as follows:) □ will	be entered and an e.	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed aff because applicant failed to provide a s was not earlier presented. See 37 CF	showing of good an				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed aff entered because the affidavit or other showing a good and sufficient reasons 	evidence failed to c why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections unde y and was not earlier presen	er appea nted. Se	l and/or appellant fail: e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is enton REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTH	•	n of the status of the claims	after en	try is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has to See Continuation Sheet. 	peen considered bu	t does NOT place the applic	cation in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclo</i> . 13. ☐ Other:	sure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>2</u>	<u> 2007090</u>	<u>4</u>	
		/Kenneth R Horlic		nit 1637	

Continuation of 3. The proposed amendments to the claims raise new issues that would require further search and consideration, and therefore, the amendment has not been entered. The proposed amendment raises new issues, because it does more than simply incorporate the limitations of cancelled claims 20 and 36 into claims 18 and 34, respectively. In addition to incorporating a step of "separating nucleic acid molecules made during said amplification regimen by size and/or by charge", the amendment also requires that the amplification products be distinctly sized. Also, regarding claim 34, Applicant's amendment to the claim add the word "second" in step (a) line 14 narrows the scope of the claim beyond what has been previously considered. Therefore, this amendment to claim 34 requires additional search and consideration. Finally, the proposed amendment to claim 62 raises issues that require further search and consideration, because in addition to incorporating a step of "separating nucleic acid molecules made during said amplification regimen by size and/or by charge", the amendment also requires that the amplification products be distinctly sized and the distinguishable label is detected in distinctly sized amplification products. These limitations require further search and consideration.

It is noted, however, that if entered, the proposed amendment would overcome the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) citing Myakishev.

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments are directed to the claims as amended and also focus on the declaration by Vladimir Slepnev submitted on January 9, 2008. Since the amendment and declaration were not entered, these arguments are moot, and the claims remain rejected for the reasons made of record in the Final Rejection mailed on July 9, 2007.

Continuation of 12. The information disclosure statement filed on September 4, 2007 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The information disclosure statement filed on September 4, 2007 also fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.